

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,190	06/24/2003	Maria Elena Garcia Armenta	222992 1009	
23460 7590 02/27/2007 LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900 180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE			EXAMINER	
			WANG, SHENGJUN	
CHICAGO, IL			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
·			1617	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/27/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s) GARCIA ARMENTA ET AL.				
		10/602,190					
		Examiner	Art Unit	_			
		Shengjun Wang	1617				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHIC - External after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.15 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 No	ovember 2006.					
	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)□	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)∐	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		•				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
_	12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	d in this National Stage				
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
₹ S	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachment	• •	_					
1) Notice 2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) 🔲 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) 🔲 Notice of Informal Pa					
Papei	No(s)/Mail Date	6)					

Application/Control Number: 10/602,190 Page 2

Art Unit: 1617

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt of applicants' amendments and remarks submitted November 30, 2006 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raffa et al. (EP 0 546 676) and Mauskop (U.S. 5,914,129), and in further view of Saslawski et al. (US 6,372,255), and Physicians' Desk Reference.
- 3. Raffa et al. teaches a pharmaceutical composition comprising a tramadol compound and a non-steroid anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID), and the method of using the same for treating pain. The composition provides benefits, such as less opioid side effects and synergistic pharmacological effects. See the abstract. Tramadol compounds may be any salts of tramadol, such as hydrochloride salt. See, particularly, page 3, lines 26-34. Any of the well-known NSAID may be used in the composition. The ratio of tramadol to NSAID is in the range of 1:1 to1:200. The composition may be prepared according to conventional pharmaceutical compounding techniques. Known pharmaceutical carrier and other excipients may be used in the composition and the composition may be in the any of the known dosage forms, such as powders, capsules, etc. See, particularly, page 3, line 50 to page 4, line 49. Mauskop also disclosed a pharmaceutical composition for treating pain comprising an opioid analgesic agent and a non-opioid agent,

Art Unit: 1617

wherein tramadol is expressly taught as one of the preferred opioid agent and ketorolac as one of the preferred non-opioid agents. See, particularly the claims.

- 4. The primary references do not teach expressly the particular carrier and excipients recited herein, or the particular salts of tramadol and ketorolac, or the amounts of each of the ingredients in the composition.
- 5. However, Saslawski et al. teaches that the particular carrier and excipients herein are well-known pharmaceutical carrier and excipients. See, particularly, column 5, line 37 to column 6, line 67. Further, Physicians' Desk Reference reveals that tramadol chloride and ketorolac tromethamine are the known salt currently employed clinically for tramadol and ketorolac.

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed the invention was made, to make a pharmaceutical composition for treating pain comprising ketorolac tromethamine and tramadol hydrochloride as herein recited. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make a pharmaceutical composition for treating pain comprising ketorolac tromethamine and tramadol hydrochloride as herein recited because tramadol and ketorolac are known to be used together and to provide benefit such as less opioid side effects and pharmacological synergistic effects, and ketorolac tromethamine and tramadol hydrochloride are the particularly salts used clinically. Note the optimization of a result effective parameter, e.g., the amount of therapeutical agents, or the amounts of the well-known pharmaceutical excipients, is considered within the skill of the artisan. See, In re Boesch and Slaney (CCPA) 204 USPQ 215. Further note that "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105

Art Unit: 1617

USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). As to claim 6, note a method of making a composition by merely mixing or combining ingredients is considered <u>prima facie</u> obvious. Analyzing the contend of a pharmaceutical composition for assuring the quality would have been within the purview of ordinary skill in the art.

Response to the Arguments

Applicants' amendments and remark submitted November 30, 2006 have been fully considered, but are not persuasive.

6. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicants argue that the references do not teach or suggest a composition containing the particular combination of ingredients recited in the claims. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

The prima references teaches a composition containing the combination of comprising a tramadol compound and a non-steroid anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID), such as ketorolac, and the method of using the same for treating pain. The primary references particularly teach the composition may be prepared according to conventional pharmaceutical compounding techniques. Known pharmaceutical carrier and other excipients may be used in the composition and the composition may be in the any of the known dosage forms, such as powders, capsules, etc. All the other ingredients recited herein are well-known pharmaceutical excipients. Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate them in the pharmaceutical composition containing the combination of a tramadol compound and a non-steroid anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID).

Page 5

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shengjun Wang whose telephone number is (571) 272-0632. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Application/Control Number: 10/602,190

Art Unit: 1617

Page 6

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shengjun Wang Primary Examiner Art Unit 1617

5 Limy

CHENGIUNWANG